


Subject: Information on Alternatives
Resent-From: Islandereast.Comments@noaa.gov
Date: Wed, 19 Feb 2003 15:34:13 -0500
From: "John B. Lust" <johnblust@rcn.com>
To: "NOAA Islander East Comments" <IslanderEast.comments@noaa.gov>


To whom it may concern:

I am attaching a letter I just submitted to the FERC regarding Islander East's proposed project. The information is FYI as it pertains to a viable and simple alternative to the Islander East proposal. I know this factors into your decision on the appeal so it's important that you know this exists.

If you need more information on this let me know.

John B. Lust

 BRCLtrtoFERC12-4-02.doc	Name: BRCLtrtoFERC12-4-02.doc Type: WINWORD File (application/msword) Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message
---	--

 BRCJTVENTUREPROPOSAL.doc	Name: BRCJTVENTUREPROPOSAL.doc Type: WINWORD File (application/msword) Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message
---	---

Magalie R. Salas
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

February 19, 2003

RE: Islander East Pipeline Company
Docket Numbers: CP01-384-000, CP01-385-000, CP01-386-000

Dear Ms. Salas:

I chair Branford's Blue Ribbon Committee which was established to study Islander East's natural gas pipeline proposal. I am also a commissioner of Planning and Zoning and have a background in marina design, construction and management.

I know you must be overwhelmed with emotional requests at this point. I also know that according to some, because of the coastal consistency issue, your agency may have acted a bit prematurely in issuing Islander East a certificate. Recognizing a standoff, I have a solution I would like you to consider.

Understanding the Iroquois proposal of more than 10 years ago and knowing that the company has planned the extension of their gas line to Eastern Long Island for that long, I was at first taken back by Duke Energy's (Islander East LLC) attempt to jump in ahead of them. After all, Iroquois saw the need, made the financial commitment and built the infrastructure to support it. Connecticut paid the environmental costs and went through the learning curve. Iroquois has always said they were waiting for the market to develop on Long Island. This is a rational argument, one in fact supported by your agency.

Two problems exist however: 1. There is a need that Duke Energy sees and Iroquois apparently does not. The region needs gas and Iroquois should really have built their extension years ago.

2. Duke Energy, an energy provider responsible for much of this country's infrastructure is in trouble financially but is willing to provide needed infrastructure. At the same time we have a provider with the most logical route for getting gas to Eastern Long Island who doesn't want to build it. It's probably not in the country's best interest to have Duke Energy fold but it's probably not in the region's best interest environmentally to have Duke build their proposed pipeline.

Duke Energy's need for a profitable venture and the available Iroquois route seem a perfect match. In fact, Long Island's need issue is best addressed if Islander East were instructed by your agency to build the Eastern Long Island Extension off of the existing Iroquois system. They could have gas to the shores of Eastern Long Island in seventeen days from hook-up to the Iroquois system. Iroquois could then upgrade their system as need and market developed.

It's a sensible plan, especially with the recant down-grading of Sable Island reserves since Iroquois has a direct connection to Canada and their huge mainland reserves. Not only do both companies benefit financially, Connecticut's environmental issues are eliminated. When you consider that the proposed Islander East system can't handle pressures required by Long Island's power plants, it becomes clear that without cooperating on the Iroquois alternative, Islander East (Duke) has no chance of success or at least shouldn't.

Your agency has the authority to direct this and I'm told, the precedent as well. Please let me know if you decide to pursue this, I'd be glad to assist if I could be of help. I do have a working relationship with all the parties involved.

Respectfully,

John B. Lust Jr.

Attachment: Joint Cooperation Proposal

COOPERATIVE CONCEPT ISLANDER EAST AND IROQUOIS GAS TRANSMISSION COMPANY WORKING TOGETHER TO PROVIDE GAS TO EASTERN LONG ISLAND

**Prepared by:
Branford's Blue Ribbon Committee**

John B. Lust, chairman

In its Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for Islander East LLC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) has recognized a less environmentally damaging System Alternative to Islander's proposed pipeline project. That alternative follows the route from Milford, CT to Wading River, NY currently proposed by the **Iroquois Gas Transmission Company** for its Eastern Long Island (**ELI**) Extension. This alternative involves installing a single pipeline from the existing Iroquois pipeline at a point about 2 miles off-shore Milford, CT, across Long Island Sound to Eastern Long Island. After a review of both proposals it is clear that the Iroquois **ELI** extension alternative offers a solution to Long Island's energy needs that will be quicker to install while minimizing impacts to Connecticut's upland and offshore environments. It also provides better and more reliable gas service to NY.

The FERC stated that it chose to certificate the more environmentally damaging Islander East project in part to increase the diversity of transport options. The FERC, however, failed to recognize another potential means to reach its stated objective without damage to the environment. That alternative would be for **Islander East** to construct and operate a pipeline from the Iroquois pipeline off-shore Milford, CT to Long Island. By making use of existing Iroquois

infrastructure, this plan offers the least environmental impact while allowing ultimate capacity to be determined by prevailing market forces as the FERC states it wishes.

The purpose of this communication is to compare the costs and benefits of this alternative with the current Islander East proposal, not to second-guess the FERC on how ownership and management of the new pipeline might be structured. It could be a joint venture between Iroquois and Islander East, or Islander East could own and operate the pipeline independently. Having Islander East involved in some way however, would help ensure a measure of competition in the Long Island energy market. And, in fairness to Islander East, their efforts to supply Long Island with natural gas would not be at a loss.

CONCEPT OF COOPERATION

That the proposed Iroquois Gas Transmission Company's ELI System alternative be accepted as the means of supplying natural gas to Eastern Long Island, but that Iroquois Gas Transmission Company control only its present system and any upgrades on land in Connecticut that are necessary to meet the market demand on Long Island.

That Islander East then build, own and be responsible for operating the extension from offshore in Milford, across Long Island Sound to its' proposed system on Long Island. Because Islander East LLC and the Iroquois Gas Transmission Company are two competing companies, this relationship may have to be directed by the FERC. However, under this arrangement Long Island would get the gas it needs at the correct pressures in the shortest possible time

Both of these competing companies would profit although each to a lesser extent, the environmental impact to Connecticut, Long Island Sound and Long Island would be minimized, the size of the system would be determined by market demand and last but not least, we would be supporting the sensible concept of cross-Sound corridors for utilities.

ANALYSIS OF NEED

1. The Island

comp

Long I

applic

2. FERC ha

needs

need

allows

3. If KeySp

Island

devel

consu

feder

these

regula

Factors that favor the use of the Milford route:

1. The use of the single pipeline from off-shore Milford, CT, to Shoreham, NY, minimizes impact to Long Island Sound by having a route across the Sound that is approximately 5.5 miles (25%) shorter than the Islander East proposed line and by reducing the length of shellfish bed crossed by more than 60% (only 25% of one commercial fishing lease is impacted along it's entire route). It also eliminates the mounding of tens of thousands of cubic yards of sediment in a near-shore area. These mounds will be subject to massive erosion and sediment distribution by waves generated in even moderate wind events, leading to unnatural amounts of sediment dispersion onto Stony Creek shellfish beds.
2. The Iroquois pipe is stronger than the proposed Islander line and according to Iroquois engineers, has been tested to withstand "anchor drops" typical of ocean going vessels.
3. The existing Iroquois upland system is a far safer system than that which Islander East proposes to build. The Iroquois system is a class 3 system with a greater wall strength than Islander's proposed system and additionally, it is encased in concrete to ensure safety. It is also pressure tested to 2200 psi. A system of this type, according to Iroquois engineers, is generally considered impenetrable. Islander East's system is not. Neither is the aging Algonquin system that Islander East proposes to tie into. The Iroquois system ties into all the Northeast's gas infrastructure (including Algonquin's) but in addition has a class three line running straight North into Canada

4. The Iroquois System is a higher pressure system (700 psi delivered to Long Island)
plants
contin
supply
gas. 1
Island
need
enviro
5. Becau
and in
followin
uncer
6. The le
one c
closec
anticip
elimin
7. Shoul
Iroqu
with 6.
Iroqu
prop

8. Utilizing the Iroquois alternative therefore eliminates the necessity of

resolvi

imme

can th

requir

enviro

Long

becau

9. Utilizin

New

crossi